STATEMENT OF REASONS (FROM TRANSCRIPT)

* * * * * * * *

2.1

THE COURT: Mr. DiMento was correct that

Dr. Schussel presents for me a defendant who is different from
the defendant I ordinarily see in this courtroom. The last
person I sentenced was I think a sentence I imposed on Tuesday
of this year, a man named Gabriel Ortiz. Mr. Ortiz came before
me having distributed ten grams of crack cocaine. He had two
previous convictions for -- one at age 17 he sold a bag or
distributed some marijuana, and one when he was 18, he sold
some heroin.

Mr. Ortiz came to this courtroom looking at a minimum of 22 years in prison for selling ten grams of crack cocaine. And but for his lawyer, he was alone.

There is a difference in the persons, in the crime, and also in the nature of the punishment. Mr. Ortiz had no one to speak for him but his lawyer and himself.

I think it's a wonderful thing, a wonderful thing to have 59 people write to me about Dr. Schussel, and that's extraordinary. They tell me of his good works, and I don't — I admire the good works. But when I sentence, I have to think of why I don't have anything like that from Mr. Ortiz. He had nothing to give. He ran away from home from an abusive, drug addicted mother at age 13, he lived on the streets, and was taken in by a friend, who was a drug dealer. Mr. Ortiz became

addicted to drugs himself, and he made his money by selling drugs on the street.

I didn't give him 22 years. The ultimate punishment was eight years.

But I raise his case to raise the question with all of you here: Should Gabriel Ortiz go to a federal penitentiary for 22 years or eight years and Dr. Schussel not go or should go for just a year because Mr. Ortiz sold some drugs, Dr. Schussel evaded his taxes?

There's a difference, to be sure, in the crime and the effect on society of the crimes. It's just the government who was the victim of this crime, who was the victim of the crime, and it was the larger society that was the victim of Mr. Ortiz' crime. Perhaps one could argue that by taking money from the government by tax evasion Dr. Schussel took \$8 million that might have gone to public housing, that might have gone to safer streets to protect us from people like Gabriel Ortiz.

But in today's world I have to look, I'm afraid, at both these men, men who have been convicted of felonies in this courtroom. The nature of the crime has an influence on me, to be sure. But I start out with the fact that both persons are convicted of felonies, of offenses against the United States of America.

There's no way that Mr. Ortiz can avoid prison; he has nothing to give, he has given to nobody, he's helped

2.1

nobody, couldn't even pay his fine, didn't have enough money. Twenty-four years old. And when he gets out, I wonder what he'll do. In prison he got a GED. He impressed me because he was studying after his GED, continued to study, continued to work. He stopped selling drugs. He came in here after being shot at a bar, somebody shot him six times causing him to lose several of his organs, and yet he went to prison.

So it's in that context I look at this crime. I'm going to take into account all the things I must take into account in sentencing Dr. Schussel, the good he has done, the person that he is in determining this sentence.

Mr. DiMento did mention some things I remembered from the trial about the good Dr. Schussel has done.

Mr. DiMento did remind me that Diane Reed testified that Dr. Schussel paid for the education of at least one of her children, maybe more, and I remember that. And I see from these letters and from the way that the defendants have prepared their papers with me emphasizing all the good that Dr. Schussel has done and that he can do. And I ask myself about Dr. Schussel because it's not a question I have to ask about Gabriel Ortiz because I know why he was in here. I know what path brought him to me.

Dr. Schussel, I can't fathom the path that brought him to me, a man who has made much of himself, extraordinary education, extraordinary advantages. I know it started out

2.1

badly, and I admire you, Dr. Schussel, for overcoming the terrible circumstances of your early life.

Ms. Ortiz says it's greed. I don't think it's that simple, because I don't think a man is characterized by greed who commits this offense at the same time he's giving away money, he's educating people, he's raising money for others, he's giving \$2 million to M.I.T., he's helping people along. That's not the man full of greed.

I don't know what it is. It's Greek. This is a Greek tragedy, like a Greek tragedy. There's a flaw. I don't understand what it is. It would be easier for me if I knew what the flaw was, what it is that brings Dr. Schussel to me. And while I sat in the back and talked to my staff, I tried to say to myself, What is it that brings Dr. Schussel to me? Why is he here? I can't figure it out.

What I can say, however, is that the crime has been committed, it must be punished. I must take it seriously, even though some would say it's just evasion of taxes, it's just the government's money, but I can't let the next person who says it's just the government's money, it is just tax evasion, I can't let that person do it without thinking of Dr. Schussel. I have got to send a message that it isn't just the government's money; it's the money that belongs to all of us. And you don't get a break merely because you have the means to do good and that you have the heart to do good and that you do

good when you commit a crime.

So I'm going to impose a sentence, not the guideline sentence, it's going to be below the guideline sentence, but it's going to be a sentence that takes into account the seriousness of this crime, the need for me to tell the world that if you commit this crime, I will take it seriously if you appear here, and that the federal courts generally will take it seriously.

In fashioning the sentence, I take into account all the good that Dr. Schussel has done, all the things that are recounted to me in the 59 letters that I have, including the two from your grandchildren, or two from your grandchildren. I take into account your age, Dr. Schussel. I think Mr. DiMento overstates it when he says you are at the end of your life. There is still more that you can give, but you are not 24, like Mr. Ortiz was. You have lived a productive life, and there is more, a greater productive life that you can live, and you have the means and the will to do productive things in the future. I take that into account.

I take into account your health, the fact you have a myriad of health problems, gastrointestinal problems, degenerative arthritis, asthma, sinusitis, and I determine the sentence with all of those things in mind.

So unless someone objects, I am prepared to impose sentence.

